

REMARKS

1. In response to the final Office Action mailed January 3, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-50, 52-55 and 57-59 were last presented for examination. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 13 and 57-59 were allowed and claims 1-50 and 52-55 were rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 1-4, 10-20, 25-30, 34-40, 42-47 49-51 and 53 have been amended, claims 9, 22, 33, 41, 48 and 54-55 have been cancelled, and no claims have been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-8, 10-21, 23-32, 34-40, 42-47, 49-50, 52 and 54-55 will be pending in this application. Of these fifty (50) claims, ten (10) claims (claims 1, 13, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50 and 53) are independent.

2. Based upon the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and that they be withdrawn.

Amendments to the Drawings

3. In a reply to the Office Action mailed May 31, 2007, Applicants submitted formal drawings to replace the drawings filed on July 30, 2003. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge that the replacement drawings have been accepted by the Examiner, and that the replacement drawings have been entered into the record.

Amendments to the Specification

4. Applicants have amended the specification to clarify embodiments of the present invention that were originally disclosed in the filed application. Applicants respectfully assert that these amendments do not add new subject matter.

Examiner Interview

5. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative in the telephonic interviews which took place on February 22, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed proposed amendments to the claims. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47 and 50 would likely make these claims allowable. The Examiner further agreed that

the proposed removal of claim elements from these claims would not alter the likely patentability of claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47 and 50.

6. The Examiner also agreed that the minor amendments to claim 13 would not cause the Examiner to withdraw the indication of allowance. The Examiner indicated that further review and consideration would be necessary before indicating that independent claims 49 and 53 were likely to be allowed in view of the proposed amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 13 and 57-59 are allowed. Applicants have amended claim 13 to add clarity. Applicants submit that the above amendments to claim 13 do not alter the scope of the claim, and respectfully submit that amended claim 13 is patentable over the art of record.

8. Applicants also thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-12, 14-27, 28-34, 35-44 and 50-52 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. As discussed below, Applicants have amended these claims to overcome these rejections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph

9. The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1-12, 14-44, 50 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the first partial friendly error-detectable key fragment” in independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35 and 50. Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 28, 35 and 50 to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the above limitation. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

10. Applicants have also made additional amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35 and 50 to add clarity to the claims. Applicants submit that these amendments do not alter the scope of the claims, and that the amended claims are patentable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

11. The Examiner has rejected claims 45-49 and 53-54 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,028,192 to Butler, (hereinafter, "Butler"). Applicants have cancelled claim 55 thereby rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

12. Applicants have amended independent claims 45, 47, 49 and 53 by adding limitations that are similar to the limitations of allowed claim 13. The limitations added by Applicants include the limitations discussed with the Examiner in the telephone conference of December 5, 2007. During the interview with the Examiner on February 22, 2008, the Examiner indicated that amended claims 45 and 47 are likely to be patentable in view of the proposed claim amendments. Although the Examiner determined that additional consideration would be necessary for claims 49 and 53, Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above claim amendments, claims 49 and 53 are patentable over the art of record. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 45, 47, 49 and 53 be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

13. The dependent claims incorporate all the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are also allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

14. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

15. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any cancelled claims or other subject matter disclosed in this application in a continuation or divisional application. Thus, cancellations and amendments of above claims, are not to be construed as an admission regarding the patentability of any claims.

Dated: March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael G. Verga/

Michael G. Verga

Registration No.: 39,410

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 Eye Street, N.W.

Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 331-7111 (Tel)

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Agent for Applicant